UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/522,338	01/09/2006	Jun Mase	264745US0PCT	6460	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER		
			BULLOCK, IN SUK C		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1797			
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			07/29/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/522,338	MASE ET AL.		
Examiner	A 1 1 ! 4		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	IN SUK BULLOCK	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 July 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL		-	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of <i>n</i> eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extraction date of the second second in the second	ension and the corresponding amount on the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
(a) The proposed amendment(s) flied after a final rejection, by the proposed after a final rejection and the proposed after a final rejection and by the proposed a			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		, ,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.12	l6 and 41.33(a)).		
4. \square The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>8</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4-8,12,13 and 17-21</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	hofore or on the date of filing a No	ation of Annual will not	he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10.	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/In Suk Bullock/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1797	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendments change the scope of the claims and, therefore, would require further search and consideration. For example, the proposed amendment to independent 8 incorporating the limitations of claims 17, 19, 20 and 21 (wherein claims 19, 20 and 21 originally depended from independent claim 17) changes the scope of claim 8.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments advanced by Applicants are not persuasive.

The argument that "high-purity adamantanes are efficiently produced in an industrially advantageous process, wherein the adamantanes obtained by using a solid catalyst are purified economically by crystallization treatment and without imposing environmental load" is not convincing because Kojima employs the same catalyst and in the absence of hydrogen chloride as claimed. Using crystallization method to recover the adamantane product is known in the art as evidenced by Honna (US Patent 3,944,626; Examples 1 and 2).

The argument that "the adamantane obtained in the reaction and concentration steps is directly purified by crystallization without a solvent with a yield of adamantad from 8-14% by mass with a purity of 98% by mass" is not convincing because this is not part of the claim.

In view of the foregoing, the claimed invention is obvious over the applied prior art to Kojima.